

Received FROM T.K.  
12-9-96

VERY SENSITIVE

01-0151

①

Judy, there is a question you've raised with me a couple of times that I tried to answer as best I could, but I didn't feel that I did a very good job of answering it. Since the issue is one that you seem to find disturbing, I'll try to answer your question more clearly now.

You asked how someone like me, who seems to be sensitive to other people's feelings and not vicious or predatory, could do what I've done. Probably the biggest reason why you find my actions incomprehensible is that you have never experienced sufficiently intense anger and frustration over a long enough period of time. You don't know what it means to be under an immense burden of frustrated anger or how vicious it can make one.

Yet there is no inconsistency between viciousness toward those whom one feels are responsible for one's anger, and gentleness toward other people. If anything, having enemies augments one's kindly feelings toward those whom one regards as friends or as fellow victims.

I want to make it clear that I am offering these remarks not as justification but only as explanation. I don't expect you to feel that my actions were justified.

Do I feel that my actions were justified? To that I can give you only a qualified yes. My feelings at a given time depend in part on whether I am winning or losing. When I am



losing (for example now, when the system has me in jail) I have no doubts or regrets about the means that I've used to fight the system. But when I feel that I'm winning (for example, between the time when the manifesto was published and the time of my arrest), I start feeling sorry for my adversaries, and then I have mixed emotions about what I've done.

Thomas Mosser, for instance, was a practitioner of what I consider to be the slimy technique of public relations, which corporations and other large organizations use to manipulate public opinion, but it does not necessarily follow that he was ill-intentioned. He may simply have felt that the system as it exists today is inevitable, and that he could accomplish nothing by going into another line of work. And of course his death hurt his wife and children, too.

So I can't blame you for feeling troubled about what I've done. In fact, I respect you the more because you have raised this difficult question, even though it makes me uncomfortable to try to answer it. I suppose that to sympathize with my actions one has to hate the system as I hate it, or at least one has to have experienced the kind of prolonged, frustrated anger that I've experienced. I think you have the good fortune never to have gone through anything like that.

I'm grateful that, in spite of your feelings about my actions, you are working so hard to win my case for me.



VERY SENSITIVE

01-0153

Not as justification, but only to put things in perspective, I offer the following comment.

During the latest U.S. invasion of Panama at least 300 civilians (some say 1,000 or more) were killed through the actions of the U.S. forces. Yet, as far as I know, George Bush has never expressed any remorse or even any mixed feelings about ordering the invasion. (He didn't know in advance that civilians were going to be killed, but he must have realized that there would be a very high risk of civilian deaths, since that sort of thing is commonplace in war).

What was George Bush's motive for ordering the invasion? Certainly it was not to topple a nasty dictator, since there are lots of equally nasty two-bit dictators that the U.S. doesn't bother about. Bush claimed his motive was to stop Noriega's participation in drug trafficking, but it seems to be agreed that by the time of the invasion Noriega was no longer of central importance to the drug trade, and obviously this dictator's removal has done nothing to slow the flow of drugs to the U.S.

Speculations as to Bush's real motive include: a desire to gain political advantage by carrying out a successful military operation; or a desire



to install in Panama a government favorable to the United States's retention of control over the Canal Zone when the current treaty expires. But I've heard of no plausible motive for the Panama invasion that would justify 300 civilian deaths.

Yet mainstream opinion does not regard Bush's action as criminal. Why? Because his way of killing people is conventionally acceptable in our society.



TED KACZYNSKI  
to

November 1, 2001

U.K.

Dear Professor

Thanks for your letter (even though it bears the inauspicious date of October 3 — my brother's birthday). I don't object to word-processed letters.

I'm not sure what you're looking for from me, since you don't ask any specific questions or raise any specific points that you want me to address. But since you're an expert in Islamic studies, I do have some fairly specific points that I'd like you to address.

Like a lot of people, I've been wondering (and not only since Sept. 11) about the significance of militant Islam, and in particular about the motivations of the militants. Some of the motivating factors involved are obvious: resistance to modernization, religious fanaticism, the leaders' drive for power, and "nationalism." \* But the relative importance of the various factors, and their exact nature, has been very unclear to me.

The first thing I read that seemed to throw

---

\* I use the word "nationalism", in quotes, because the phenomenon is similar to nationalism, but differs from it in that it involves identification not with a nation but with a religion.



any real light on the subject was an article in Time Magazine, October 15, 2001, pages 70-71, titled "Osama's Endgame." This article seems to show that Osama Bin Laden's motives (whatever he may tell himself about them) are not primarily religious piety, or resistance to modernity, but rather "nationalism and the drive for power. If the article can be believed, Bin Laden wants nuclear weapons and economic strength for the Islamic world so that it can become a "great power." In other words Bin Laden, behind a veneer of piety, just wants to play the same power-game that states have played almost since the beginning of civilization. It's a game that threatens to become unprecedentedly disastrous, in several respects, because states now have at their disposal the increasingly horrible tools of modern technology.

But I don't know how seriously to take the Time article, because I've learned through my own experience that the news media are sloppy in their research and do not hesitate to distort the truth.

So my first question is: Do you think the article is roughly accurate in its portrayal of Bin Laden's motives?

Assuming that the article is more-or-less accurate as to Bin Laden personally, to what extent can he be taken as representative of militant Islam as a whole? I don't doubt that there are a great many militant Muslims for whom



religious belief is more important than "nationalism" and the drive for worldly power, but I strongly suspect that those for whom worldly power is most important will tend to dominate the movement. Do you agree, or not?

I also wonder about the strength and nature of the resistance to modernity. Assuming that the article mentioned above is correct, it seems clear that Bin Laden and his associates do not reject modern technology and industrialization — since the Islamic world could hardly become a great power without them. Bin Laden et al resist only the social changes that have accompanied modernization, e.g., collapse of traditional values, irreligion, and unbridled hedonism. I think there is significant resistance to modern technology in the Islamic world,\* but my guess is that the forces of what I've called "nationalism" will easily prevail over any resistance to modern technology.

Do you agree with the foregoing paragraph, or not?

---

\* It is interesting that I've received a couple of postcards, unsigned but apparently from the same person, bearing postage stamps of the United Arab Emirates and the words, "From Dubai." No other message; but I assume the sender of the cards knew what I stand for and meant to express his support.



Assuming I am right in thinking that the dominant goal of militant Islam (or at least of its most important leaders) is to create an Islamic "great power," and one that is free of the social changes that have accompanied modernization elsewhere ~~then~~ it seems to me that its project is doomed to fail. Creation of a great power would require industrialization; and it would appear that successful, efficient industrialization is incompatible with the existing culture of the Middle East. An attempt to industrialize that region either will fail or will lead to the same kinds of social changes that have accompanied industrialization elsewhere.

Would you comment on the foregoing paragraph?

I would also guess that, even if the leaders were to drop all resistance to modernizing social changes, creation of a fully-developed and efficient industrial economy in the Middle East<sup>still</sup> would be exceedingly slow and difficult, because the culture isn't amenable to it and won't change easily. In particular, there is not enough social discipline there — or not enough social discipline of the right kind. Do you agree or disagree?

Even though a fully-developed industrial economy in the Middle East seems unlikely for the foreseeable future, I can well imagine a Middle-Eastern state that as a whole is inefficient and backward, but in which a relatively small, elite



minority creates (on a modest scale) an advanced industrial and technological structure within the more backward whole. Maybe some of the Middle Eastern ~~the~~ states already are approaching this condition? What do you think about this?

The possible creation of advanced industrial and technological structures in the Middle East worries me exceedingly. I think that what the West is doing with modern technology is criminally reckless. But I also think that the West shows more self-restraint in the use of its (technological and other) power than most other cultures do. In other words, I think most other cultures that to some degree have access to modern technology use it even more recklessly than the West does. (Did you ever ask yourself what some of these Third-World countries are doing with their nuclear waste?) And it seems to me that there is more recklessness in the Middle East than elsewhere. The danger lies not only in the reckless use of intentionally destructive technologies such as that of nuclear weapons, but also in supposedly benign applications of technologies (e.g., genetic engineering) that may have unanticipated, disastrous consequences. What do you think? Am I right in believing that there is a certain kind of recklessness in Middle-Eastern cultures?

Twenty-odd years ago I worked in a small factory with a man from Pakistan. He was very



intelligent, an excellent worker, and I liked him very well. But by way of a joke he used to point a knife at me — a box-cutter knife, as it happened — and say, "I weel keel you!" He apparently did not realize that that kind of humor was ~~no~~ not acceptable in the West.

This is only an anecdote, but it illustrates what I think other evidence seems to support — that in Middle Eastern cultures there is far less inhibition about violence, killing, and destructiveness generally than there is in the West. Am I right about this?

\* \* \*

Now let me return to your letter. Your fourth paragraph is obscure to me. Do you mean that you formerly opposed loss of human life but are now more ready to accept it? Or vice versa? You indicate that the deaths at the World Trade Center have affected you more deeply than violent deaths elsewhere in the world. Is this because you see the W.T.C. people as more like yourself, so that you can identify more closely with them? You ask whether that makes you a racist. Whether you call yourself a racist is up to you, but personally I think the leftists' use of the word racist is absurd. If the term is to be applied as broadly as the leftists apply it, then probably 99.9% of people throughout the world's history have been racists.



Also, I'm highly skeptical of the claim that "deaths of innocents occur every day in hundreds of thousand [sic] through the depredations of imperialism." Where I've had opportunity to compare information from leftists with information from sources that I have good reason to believe are reliable, I've found the leftists' information to be shamelessly slanted. (Same true of information from the right.) And, assuming that that statistic ("hundreds of thousands of deaths") were correct, how would your leftist friends balance those deaths against the lives saved by Western medicines and medical technology, Western agricultural technology, etc.? (Not that I think that's good. If I could, I would eliminate all advanced technology everywhere, including medical and agricultural technology.)

And why would you run a support group for I.R.A. prisoners? I certainly can't claim to be well-informed about Northern Ireland, but from the little I know it seems to me that what is going on there is essentially just a blood-feud between the Catholics and the Protestants, and I see no reason why any outsider should think that one side was better than the other.

Sincerely yours,

Ted Kaczynski



You write: "We have noticed that seemingly insignificant individuals are able to garner huge audiences (on the Internet and/or You Tube<sup>[\*]</sup>), for expressing their views, singing, or entertaining others. These ideas often go 'viral' in a matter of minutes, but they are seldom intellectual ideas."

It sounds as if the phenomena you refer to are what sociologists call "fads" or "crazes". Fads and crazes are briefly discussed in the Encyclopaedia Britannica article "Collective Behavior" (15th ed., 2003, Vol. 16, pages 558-59), and are discussed at much greater length by Neil J. Smelser, Theory of Collective Behavior, Macmillan, New York, 1971. Fads and crazes are usually harmless and ephemeral phenomena that serve only to entertain the people who participate in them. Fads and crazes can occasionally have dangerous consequences (e.g., the antisemitic outburst mentioned in the Britannica article), but with its powers of propaganda and of physical coercion the technoindustrial system seems to be consistently able to prevent these occurrences from getting out of hand. Moreover, even if a fad or a craze did totally escape the system's restraints

\*

I have no idea what You Tube is.



About Obama... it's interesting that you worked on his campaign. I at first favored Hillary Clinton for president, but after she was out of the picture I favored Obama. I mean, I don't think any of our politicians are worth a damn, so when I say I "favor" a politician for an office, I just mean that I think he or she is the least of the available evils. I favored Clinton and later Obama mainly because I figured a Democratic president would be much more likely than a Republican to appoint judges and Supreme Court Justices who have some respect for constitutional rights. (From my own experiences with the judicial system I know how important that is!) But now I'm afraid Obama is going to be a big disappointment in that respect. The people he has appointed as Attorney



TJK to LYDIA ECCLES 4/16/09

2

0145.2

General and Solicitor General both say they think the government should be able to hold alleged terrorists indefinitely without trial. Of course, the government can claim that anyone is a terrorist, and if there is no trial that claim is never tested. So in effect the government would be able to lock up anyone indefinitely.

Thus, on the basis of Obama's choices for Attorney General and Solicitor General, I don't think there is any reason to hope that he will appoint good judges.

About my composition -- yes you're right,